

### **REMARKS**

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for granting the personal interview conducted on October 4, 2006. During the interview, Applicants' representative pointed out differences between the teachings of the cited prior art and the claimed invention. As requested by the Examiner, these differences are reiterated below.

Claims 12–27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over “IEEE 1451: A standard in Support of Smart Transducer Networking,” (hereinafter “IEEE 1451”). For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

It is noted that, as previously asserted by Applicants (see “Amendment ‘G’” mailed June 5, 2006), the effective filing date of instant application is November 24, 1998, which is prior to the earliest publication date of the IEEE 1451 reference. In response to Applicants' assertion that the rejection is improper, the Examiner indicated that the reference is being relied upon for its reference to teachings contained in the IEEE 1451.2 standard, whose publication appears to predate the filing of the instant application. Considering this, it is respectfully submitted that the most appropriate basis for the rejection is the publication of the IEEE 1451.2 standard itself.

Turning to the substance of the rejection, IEEE 1451 does not teach or suggest “a comparing unit” having one input operationally connected to an identification unit in a peripheral self-contained hardware unit and another input connected a storage unit containing identification information of more than one hardware peripheral unit, as required by claim 12.

As described, for example, on page 5, lines 10–21 of the specification, the comparing unit (9) sequentially compares an identification entry stored in the identification memory (5) of a peripheral (3) to a series of entries stored in a storage unit (read-only memory 11) until it locates

a matching entry. The matching entry is then stored as a current configuration in the configuration memory (15).

The Examiner cites the “TEDS” of the IEEE 1451 reference as teaching the identification unit of claim 12. As explained on p. 526, under the heading “2.1 IEEE 1451.2 – Transducer-to-Microprocessor Communication Interface,” the TEDS is an electronic data sheet that contains information about a transducer. The TEDS is stored in memory provided on the transducer. As described, the transducer can be connected to a microprocessor, allowing the microprocessor to access the TEDS and read the electronic data sheet. Thus, the use of TEDS allows for “self-description” of transducers connected to a network. By contrast, the present application describes peripheral hardware units (3) that contain identifying information *without* any description or configuration information. The configuration information for many different peripherals is stored separately in a storage unit (read-only memory 11) as a sort of “library.” Thus, a comparing unit (9) is employed to compare the currently connected peripheral hardware unit (3) to the stored information in the “library” in order to locate and retrieve the corresponding configuration information. Since the TEDS in the IEEE 1451 reference already contains the electronic data sheet, there is no need for the claimed “comparing unit.” That is, according to IEEE 1451, a microprocessor *directly* obtains the TEDS (i.e. configuration information” from the connected transducer, without requiring any comparison with a stored library of data sheets.

For at least the above reasons, IEEE 1451.2 does not teach or suggest a comparing unit of claim 12. Thus, every limitation of the claim is not teach or suggested by the cited reference as required. Therefore, claims 12–23 are not obviousness for purposes of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 24–27, Applicants respectfully submit that the IEEE 1451 reference does not teach or suggest a “method for manufacturing a hearing device” as claimed. Since every limitation is not taught or suggested by the cited reference, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made sufficient to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 32794US1.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: /Aaron A. Fishman/  
Aaron A. Fishman – Reg. No. 44,682

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: January 23, 2007